



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,975	09/10/2003	Peter R. Anderson	1842.041US1	3982
70648 7590 05/22/2008 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/WMS GAMING P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
D'AGOSTINO, PAUL ANTHONY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/22/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/658,975

Applicant(s)

ANDERSON ET AL.

Examiner

Paul A. D'Agostino

Art Unit

3714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Paul A. D'Agostino.(3) John M. Hotaling, II.(2) John Fischer.(4) Eric Pryzby.

Date of Interview: 15 May 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 5,701,511 to Smith.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: After a robust discussion no agreement could be reached as to patentability of the current (or proposed amended) apparatus claims. However, it was observed that the claimed invention may be more appropriately claimed as a method (provided the support exists in the original specification as filed and subject to a new prior art search) which became apparent after the applicant described how the operation of his claimed invention overcomes the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/John M Hotaling II/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714
Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.